

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, 10, 11, 18, 20, and 21 and the title as set forth above and has also cancelled claims 7 and 17. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

The Office asserts that title of the invention is not descriptive and a new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the title as set forth above. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the title.

The Office has rejected claims 1, 7-11, 17-21, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by JP 02-219478 to Iwamatsu (Iwamatsu), claims 2-4, 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwamatsu and furthering view of JP 08-308258 to Ito et al. (Ito), claims 5, 6, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwamatsu in view of US Patent No. 3,768,495 to Spence (Spence), and claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwamatsu and US Patent No. 4,126,822 to Wahlstrom (Wahlstrom). The Office asserts Iwamatsu teaches a power system with a rotor having two sections (-/+) which rotate on a shaft between parallel electrodes 2 to generate a DC power when the - section is closer to the lower electrode and when the + section is closer the upper electrode in figure 1. The Office acknowledges that Iwamatsu does not teach a charge being at the junction of two insulating layers, but asserts Spence teaches an electrostatic charge being stored being insulating layers 14 and 16, of silicon oxide and silicon nitride.

Iwamatsu, Ito, Spence, and Wahlstrom, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, “a non-conducting member with two or more sections, each of the two or more sections has a stored static charge which is a monopole charge” as recited in claim 1, “providing a non-conducting member with two or more sections, each of the two or more sections has a stored static charge which is a monopole charge” as recited in claim 11, or “moving at least one of a non-conducting member and at least one two or more electrodes with respect to the other, wherein the member comprises two or more sections, each of the

sections has a stored static electrical charge which is a monopole charge” as recited in claim 21.

The Office’s attention is respectfully directed to the abstract and FIGS. 1-5 in Iwamatsu which discloses and clearly illustrates that each of the rotors 1, 11, 21, 31, and 41 have both positive and negative charges and thus have a dipole charge, not a monopole charge as claimed. Similarly, Ito discloses an electret rotor 1 which has opposing electrical poles and thus a dipole charge, not a monopole, fixed charge as claimed. Further, Wahlstrom was only cited for disclosing an electrostatic generator, and does not disclose or suggest a non-conducting member with a monopole, fixed charge as claimed.

As noted by the Office, Spence discloses a trapped charge at an interface between upper layer 16 and lower layer 14 at col. 2, lines 48-50, but the Office’s attention is respectfully directed to FIG. 1 and at col. 1, lines 44-46 and 64-65 which clearly shows and states the lower layer 14 is disclosed as being affixed to the counter electrode 12 while the metalized layer 22 is spaced away and flexible. The reason for this particular configuration is so the flexible electrode can move in response to mechanical forces, such as sound waves, as discussed at col. 1, lines 6-31 in Spence. However, nowhere does Spence teach or suggest a configuration where the lower and upper layers 14 and 16 do not need to be affixed to and are both spaced from the electrode 12 and metalized layer 22 as claimed. Accordingly, even if the teachings of Spence were combined with Iwamatsu as suggested by the Office, Spence would teach that the layers 14 and 16 need to be affixed to one of the electrodes, not spaced from the two or more electrodes as claimed.

With the present invention, energy is effectively extracted from the local environment from a displacement current caused by the embedded charge member’s and/or one or more of the electrodes movement due to movement of the embedded charge member from movement of a hand crank or wind, water, or other fluid movement as discussed in paragraph 73 in the above-identified patent application. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 11, and 21. Since claims 2-10 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 1, claims 12-20 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 12, and claims 22-24 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 21.

In view of all of the foregoing, Applicant submits that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 21, 2005

Gunnar G. Leinberg
Gunnar G. Leinberg
Registration No. 35,584

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Clinton Square, P.O. Box 31051
Rochester, New York 14603-1051
Telephone: (585) 263-1014
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
- ☐ transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (703) _____.

November 21, 2005
Date

Sherri A. Moscato
Signature

Sherri A. Moscato
Type or Print Name